REMARKS

I.   INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended, FIG. 1 has been amended, the abstract has been amended, claims 1-16 have been amended, and claims 17 and 18 have been added.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-18 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

II.   CHANGES TO THE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATION:

In FIG. 1, at step S2, the execution of the program ① is started, and the existence of file E is checked to see if, in fact, a file was prepared when a backup error occurred. In the example shown in the original FIG.1, OSJAR in ① is executed at step S3, which can only occur if file E exists. Therefore, FIG. 1 is amended to show that OSJAR in ① is executed at step S3 when file E exists.

In FIG. 1, at step S4, the existence of the file R is checked. In the example shown in FIG. 1, it is judged that the file R exists, meaning that a name of a file was prepared since recovery was possible. However, FIG. 1 shows the execution of the recovery program but states that this occurs when file R does not exist. Therefore, FIG.1 is amended to show that the recovery program is executed when file R exists. Support for this change to FIG. 1 can be found on page 9, lines 15-17.

In FIG. 1, at step 21, the execution of the program ③ is started, and the existence of the file C is checked to see if there exists a name of a file that is prepared when a backup has been finished normally. In the example shown in the original FIG. 1, the flag removal Prg ③ is executed at step S22 and the file B and the file C are deleted at step S23, which can only occur if, in fact, file C exists. Therefore, FIG. 1 is amended to show that Prg ③ is executed at step S22 when file C exists.

The specification has been amended to reflect the above changes to FIG. 1 at the paragraph beginning at page 8, line 4, and the paragraph beginning at page 8, line 31. No new matter is presented.

III.   CHANGES TO THE ABSTRACT:

In the Office Action, at page 2, numbered paragraph 3, the abstract is objected to as not being limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. In

view of the proposed amended abstract set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding objection to the abstract should be resolved.

IV.   REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-16 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER DEVINS ET AL (USPN 6,762,761):

The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

In Devins, there is no mechanism for automatically recognizing an operation status of the system and automatically executing a job corresponding to the recognized operation status. An operator must manually start a job after observing an operation status, or a job must be executed based on an automatic schedule. In the latter case, a program for each job must be prepared for recognizing an operation status of the system.

The present invention provides a mechanism that can automatically execute a predetermined job in a computer system after recognizing the predetermined operation status, thereby reducing time and labor spent by an operator to manually start the appropriate job corresponding to an operation status. (See page 2, line 13 et seq. of prior art discussion). Please note that independent claims 1 and 16 have been amended to include the distinction between the present invention and Devins, as described above.

Furthermore, Devins does not disclose the use of various operation statuses as defined by the present invention. According to the Abstract in Devins, status information relates to a plurality of graphics operations performed by a graphics accelerator, and does not relate to operation statuses of a computer system, as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

According to Devins, an instruction to execute a job is stored in memory 20 and the graphics processor or the display list processor 25 monitors the instructions. When the instructions indicate that the job can be executed, the display list processor (DLP) 25 issues the instructions to the graphics accelerator 30, which indicates status information relating to a plurality of graphics operations performed by the graphics accelerator. When the instructions indicate that the job cannot be executed, the DLP 25 simply delays issuing the instructions to the graphics accelerator 30. Therefore, status information, as described by Devins, does not related to various operation statuses of a computer system as described by the present invention.

The present invention is further advantageous over Devins in that an operation status of the computer system is expressed taking into consideration whether a plurality of the files exist within the memory section, as described in claims 4-5. In the present invention, each file is provided with an alias, and the operation status of the computer system is recognized based on

10

the aliases, as described in claims 6-10.

Furthermore, after the predetermined job automatically begins, the operation status of the computer system can change as a result. In the present invention, the new operation status is automatically determined and a second job will begin if necessary, as described in claims 11-15.

V. CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and, further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _March 21, 2005_   By: _____

H. J. Staas
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached drawing includes changes to FIG. 1. The sheet containing FIG. 1 replaces the original sheet including only FIG. 1. The following amendments have been made to FIG. 1: the phrase "WHEN FILE E DOES NOT EXIST" is changed to "WHEN FILE E EXISTS"; The phrase "WHEN FILE R DOES NOT EXIST" is changed to "WHEN FILE R EXISTS"; and the phrase "WHEN FILE C DOES NOT EXIST" is changed to "WHEN FILE C EXISTS".

For the convenience of the Examiner, an annotated sheet showing the changes made is attached. Approval of these changes to the Drawings is respectfully requested.

Fig.1

S1:OSJAR

S2: CHECK EXISTENCE

fileE

WHEN FILE E ~~DOES~~
~~NOT~~ EXIST_S_

S3:OSJAR   S4: CHECK EXISTENCE

fileR

WHEN
FILE R   S5:
~~DOES NOT~~   RECOVERY
EXIST_S_   S6: DELETE FILES
E AND R

S11: CHECK EXISTENCE

fileB

WHEN FILES E, B,
AND C DO NOT EXIST   S13: PREPARE

S12:
BACKUP

fileC

S14: PREPARE

S21: CHECK EXISTENCE

WHEN FILE C ~~DOES NOT~~
EXIST_S_

S23: DELETE FILES B AND C

TIME

S22: REMOVE FLAG

1/4